DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 149 EA 013 199

AUTHOR Welsh, Ralph S.
TITLE The Belt Theory of Discipline and Delinquency. Critical Issues Presentation.
PUB DATE 14 Nov 80
NOTE 20p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the New Jersey Education Association (Atlantic City, NJ, November 14, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents: *Aggression: *Child Abuse: *Corporal Punishment: *Delinquency Causes: *Discipline: Family Problems: Parent Child Relationship: Parent Influence: Punishment: Runaways: Violence: Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

Parental discipline appears to play a major role in the development of delinquent and aggressive behavior. The belt theory predicts that parents who have used corporal punishment are likely to produce children who exhibit delinquent behavior. A striking factor is that all delinquent youths see corporal punishment as necessary in child rearing and most are convinced that the beatings they received prevented them from committing homicide. The intensity level of violent parental discipline can be equated to the child's level of exhibited aggression. Thus, normal parents can expect to have aggressive children in proportion to the degree they discipline their children. The use of the belt appears to work because it produces enough fear to terminate temporarily the unwanted behavior. However, as the fear dissipates, aggression remains. The two basic responses to the threat of pain are fight and flight: females tend to run away while males are more apt to commit aggressive crimes. Cross-cultural studies relating severe parenting to aggression support this theory. The roots of violence are in the home: we cannot work with an aggressive child without focusing on the family. (Author/JK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196149

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE BELT THEORY OF DISCIPLINE AND DELINQUENCY

Ralph S. Welsh, Ph.D., ABPP
2591 Main Street
Bridgeport, Conn. 06606

CRITICAL ISSUES PRESENTATION

Read at the Annual Convention of the NEW JERSEY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,

Atlantic City, New Jersey

November 14, 1980

EA 013 199

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. S. Welsh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE BELT THEORY OF DISCIPLINE AND DELINQUENCY

Ralph S. Welsh, Ph.D.

Bridgeport, Ct.

We live in a violent society; the national homicide rate is about 20,000 persons a year. Conservative estimates fix school vandalism at more than 500 million dollars a year, and physical aggression is not confined to the street or the violent home. The experience of a New York City shop teacher who lost 6 teeth and had his jaw broken by a burly 15 year old student is a sad example (Hand, 1975). The solutions to the problem of societal violence being offered are endless. However, in regard to many frightened people concerned with education, there appears to be a renewed call for a return to what is referred to as that "old-fashioned discipline." Egerton (1976) sees this as a conservative trend in education exemplified by the "back to basics" movement, a movement many people have linked with "forced patriotism, paddling, preaching, and puritanism." When two young boys recently produced $50,000 worth of damage to a school in a quiet, upper middle class suburb of New York City, the angry townspeople blamed it on the "permissive attitudes of the schools," the leniency of the courts, and the "sparing of the rod" (Faber, 1975).

The real pessimists regarding societal aggression and violence have been the ethologists, who insist that humans, by nature, are violent and there is probably little we can do about it (see Lorenz, 1966). In a more optimistic vein, sociologists have tended to view aggression, particularly delinquent and criminal aggression, as

the result of poverty and blocked opportunity. Implicit in their reasoning is the assumption that when these evils are removed, the primary roots of violence will be uprooted, and crime will have been eliminated (see Cohen, 1955, and Cloward & Ohlin, 1960). With the advent of television, the TV set has become the newest villain, and is currently under attack as a major instigator of violence (see Rothenberg, 1975, and Sommers, 1976). This attack on the television networks curiously follows on the heels of a national outrage against permissiveness in child-rearing, the feelings of which were undoubtedly fueled by the discovery that the leaders in the anti-Vietnam protest movement of the '60's were the products of liberal middle class homes (see Wolfgang, 1970). What these anti-permissive advocates lacked was an ability to make a distinction between campus violence (which is often precipitated by the police) and criminal violence. I have little difficulty admitting that the campus protesters may have been misguided, but these were certainly not youngsters lacking in values and human concerns. Delinquents, on the other hand, are usually selfish, impulsive, and randomly destructive. Regardless of these differences, at the present time our entire country is entering into a new period of behavioral and political conservatism (witness the 1980 election results), and the tenor of the times, in no small measure, tends to dictate the prevailing child-rearing biases. I fear that such is the case with the belt theory which flies squarely in the face of the public mood. Not only does the belt theory contradict the basic assumptions leading to the two recent Supreme Court decisions sanctioning the use of corporal punishment in the schools, but it has also convinced me that the Supreme Court, and probably a large number, if not a majority, of American parents are welcoming the return of the strap-and-woodshed mentality.

The Belt Theory: Its Basic Assumptions

In its most simplistic form, the belt theory predicts that parents who have habitually "spanked" their children with implements capable of inflicting physical damage (sticks, belts, boards, fists, wooden spoons, electric cords, cat-o'-nine-tails, etc.)[1] run the perilous risk of lowering their child's aggressive threshold, and producing children who have a high probability of exhibiting behavior society commonly labels "delinquent" (see Welsh, 1976a).

The idea that corporal punishment is related to aggressive behavior is certainly not new (see Eron, et. al., 1971, and Sears, et. al., 1957). However, the far-reaching implications of the effects of corporal punishment on children is generally not recognized, and even worse, many people still insist that corporal punishment is good for children (see Feedback, 1976). Even the beaten, delinquent child is convinced that the beatings were good for him. The following are a few examples of this thinking, randomly gathered from beaten delinquent youths I saw

---

[1]The open hand to the rear is purposely being excluded, not only because it is so common in the home, but due to its limited severity. Also, it does not seem to contribute to the high levels of hostility generated by implements capable of producing physical damage. In any event, many people who argue for the spanking of children think that most everyone who spanks uses moderation. This is not true. Corporal punishment, unfortunately, is not unlike cancer and cigarette smoking. Its negative effects vary from person to person, it has a delayed action effect (see Langner, et. al., 1976), yet many who are exposed to it survive with no obvious detrimental effects. Although it may be a necessary, but not sufficient precursor to recidivist male delinquency, it clearly places a child at risk.

in my office. What is so striking about these interviews is the fact that all delinquent youths see corporal punishment as necessary in child rearing, and most are convinced that the beatings they received are the only things that kept them from committing homicide. Each of the children was asked the question, "What would happen if all the kids in the world were no longer spanked?" A few of the answers are as follows:

> White female, court referred, age 14: The kids'll just overpower the grownups. They'd do whatever they wanted, and they wouldn't try to stay out of trouble--the kids'd run away, and I guess they'd still have to go to court. Kids'd still do everything wrong, and the little kids would do bathroom in their pants. Sometimes you can tell them it's wrong to do and not to do it, but you can't give in and give 'em a piece of candy or a kiss. You see, I'm gonna pay a lot of attention to my kids, and they'll know I care--and I'll spank them when they do something wrong--not if they spill food--but if they throw food.
>
> Black male, court referred, age 14: Everybody'd be running down the street stealing, knowing they wouldn't get a beating.
>
> Puerto Rican male, court referred, age 9: Kids need to be beaten so they won't rob things from people, go into stores and rob them, and rob houses. It calms me down a little bit.

There is no question that my angry delinquent youths have all come to essentially the same conclusion; children are hit because they are bad; parents hit their children to make them behave; children, therefore, must be born bad, and if not corrected, grow up to be "terrible." Because of this rather peculiar type of learning, the delinquent grows up believing that he is basically bad, is convinced that had his parents hit him more, he probably would have been

better,[2] and that the world would be an absolutely unlivable place if parents stopped spanking their children. I have found few delinquents who do not embrace this philosophy. Clearly, parents with delinquents who are beating their children are teaching these children that beatings are good for children, and the delinquent rationalizes that he got into trouble because he simply was not beaten enough--and the cycle of beatings continues when the delinquent has children of his own. In this sense, the overpunishing parents of delinquents, and those who are known child abusers (producing obvious physical damage to the child) are both damaging their children emotionally, and are both passing on a destructive pattern of child-rearing to the next generation.

Finally, it should be noted that the first child was beaten with a belt by his father, the second youngster was beaten with broom handles, and cracked in the head with a frying pan by his mother, and the third child was disciplined with a belt, stick, and electric cord. One of these youths (the 14 year old boy) told me, "I should have been beat more. I think she should have hit me witha sledge hammer." Other youngsters I have interviewed have been "physically disciplined" with an unbelievable assortment of implements, including belts, boards, Coke bottles, hairbrushes, shoes, extension cords, sticks, cat-o'-nine-tails, 2 x 4's, rubber hoses, dog chains, and fists.

---

[2]Parents of delinquents readily admit they hit their delinquent children more than the others, explaining, "Sure, I hit him more; he was the bad one." I strongly suspect that children who are hyperkinetic become delinquent more often than others because their meddlesomeness invites the wrath of their parents more often.

General Tenets of the Belt Theory

After having worked with more than 2,000 juvenile delinquents, and having carefully surveyed more than 400 subjects including delinquents and non-delinquents, I have come to the inescapable conclusion that severe parental punishment (the use of a belt or its equivalent) in child-rearing is almost a necessary, if not sufficient precursor to habitual male delinquency. My data is not as impressive with females, but I should emphasize that females rarely engage in the kinds of aggressive crimes committed by males. In a recent analysis of an earlier study I conducted with 58 males and 19 female delinquents (see Welsh, 1976a), I was surprised to find that girls had been beaten more often, longer, and more severely than the boys, but tended to run from their homes (escape) in contrast to the boys, whose aggressive behavior (attack) skyrocketed as parental discipline increased in severity. I was left with the obvious conclusion that males are more aggressive, and more potentially aggressive than females. Moyer (1974) insists that this is true of all species, not just humans.

As a result of my 10 plus years of investigation into the effects of corporal punishment on discipline, it appears that:

1. As parental discipline increases in intensity, so does the probability that the child will engage in increasingly aggressive, and possibly delinquent activities; the most violent people in our society experienced the most violent childhoods, including such individuals as James Earl Ray, Sirhan Sirhan, Gary Gilmore, Adolf Hitler, Arthur Bremmer, Lee Harvey Oswald, and Jim Jones. In our sample of 77 delinquent males and females, the relationship between violent child-rearing and the aggressive level of the delinquent act was striking.

2. More delinquents come from poor than affluent homes, but our data

clearly indicate that parental punishment practices are more important than socio-economic class in preceding delinquency.

3. The more violent the child-rearing in a culture, primitive or otherwise, the more probable the culture will be crime-ridden. We found that black males were more aggressive than white males, but certainly not because of any innate factor, but apparently because the black culture utilizes more corporal punishment than do whites (see Welsh, 1976a). Several national surveys also reveal that blacks are paddled far more often than whites in the public schools where corporal punishment is allowed (see Inequality in Education, 1978, p. 22).

4. Since the effects of severe parenting are no respector of group or social class, so-called normal parents can expect to have aggressive children proportional to the degree they physically discipline their children.

5. Since severe parenting is highly related to the development of aggressive behavior, known abused children probably have one of the highest probabilities of becoming delinquent of all societal subgroups.

6. Differences in conditionability between delinquents and normals (see Schlichter & Ratliff, 1971, and Hare, 1968) are primarily due to habituation to fear, reducing the delinquent's ability to rely on anticipatory fear responses, making it difficult for him to avoid potentially delinquent situations. This mechanism has helped us understand why delinquents continually insist that they do not know why they engaged in the delinquent act, or were unable to anticipate its future consequences. It is my contention that in-born constitutional factors are probably of secondary importance in regard to individual differences in conditionability between delinquents and non-delinquent youths.

7. Although modeling (observing the spanking parent and seeing the father

abuse the mother) will further potentiate the child's aggressive level, the child's inability to avoid pain seems to be the critical variable in altering a child's ability to cope with his own aggressive impulses. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that the parents own disciplinary history has a marked impact on the parents' likelihood of utilizing severe punishment on his own children (see Welsh, 1975). In a study now in progress, the mother of a delinquent, a dental assistant, told me she was raised on a cat-o'-nine-tails her father made from a machine belt, remarking, "I wasn't spanked; I was beaten for the bad behavior of the younger children I was supposed to be watching." Another mother beaten by an alcoholic stepfather with a cat-o'-nine-tails, remarked, "Yeah, both of my parents used a belt on me, and how, but I don't regret it. It taught me a lesson." Obviously, the best but most impractical way of being a non-punitive parent is to be raised by non-punitive parents.

The Development of Aggression

The belt theory hypothesizes a step-by-step development of aggression, and I have separated this pattern of development into three stages:

Stage 1: From birth to about 2 years of age most youngsters develop normally since the belt is not utilized until the parent feels the child is "old enough" to hit. Severe child abuse is the exception to this rule, of course, although much less common than severe parental punishment, as I have defined it.

Stage 2: As soon as a child begins to communicate with his parents (approximately 3 to 5 years of age), the parent begins to feel the child is old enough to be hit, and the parent then assumes the punishment will inhibit further misbehavior. With the instigation of the use of the belt or its equivalent, the child is placed under stress, probably experiences increased adrenal flow (Selye, 1956), he becomes

increasingly active, exhibits anger towards the parents and may be destructive in the home or aggressive in the community when he gains greater independence.

Stage 3: During the early school years (5 to approximately 13 years of age), the child may continue to exhibit hyperactivity and behavior problems in the classroom and in the home, but he is rarely involved in behavior that the community considers criminal during the early part of Stage 3. It is fairly unusual to see a delinquent before the age of 10, but when we do see a youngster under the age of 10, the punishment history is usually severe. It is ordinarily not until 12 or 13 years of age that the delinquent is initially brought before the court, a period of time in his life he is becoming increasingly independent, experiencing new hormonal changes, and starting to openly rebel against his parents. Because of increased alienation from his parents, he begins to seek solace, support, and encouragement from his peer group. Since he seeks out peers with problems similar to his own, his parents naturally assume that bad friends are causing his delinquency. I will admit that bad friends can be a catalyst for delinquent behavior (giving each youngster added courage to misbehave), but I am quite convinced that bad friends do not cause delinquency.

As the parent continues to strike his youngster, the future delinquent gradually becomes habituated to the punishment and starts to exhibit the poor conditionability to aversive stimuli which has been so frequently seen in the psychopath. Apparently the use of the belt seems to work (it is reinforcing to the parent) because it initially produces enough fear temporarily to terminate the unwanted behavior; yet, as the fear wears off, aggression is left in its place. The child again acts out, again is beaten, the fear temporarily overrides the aggression, and since the fear wears off more rapidly than the aggression, the aggression continues to build up. The fear gradually habituates, and the child becomes more and more

uncontrollable. If the child is beaten enough, he may eventually become the cold, impersonal psychopath described by Cleckley (1955).

Eventually, the punitive parent feels that the child is too old to hit, and it is very soon after this time that the delinquent behavior emerges; that is, the belt seems to have a delayed action effect, and this has also been seen by Langner, Gersten, and Eisenberg (1976). It is my contention that it is no accident that violent crime peaks at 15, then trails off thereafter (Time, 1975, and West, 1968).

Some Varieties of Aggressive Behavior related to the Use of the Belt

The two basic responses to pain or the threat of pain are flight and fight. It is to be expected that most, if not all, runaways are trying to escape a painful situation. In a 12 year follow-up study of runaway children, Olson, Liebow, Mannino, and Shore (1980) report:

> All the runaways in the study reported that at least one parent had hit or beaten them 'more than a few times' before they ran away. Siblings, however, appear to have escaped violent punishments and severe reprimands; only two report having been struck by a parent. Significantly, the parents of two runaway children were separately reprimanded by child welfare workers for being too harsh with their children.

At the other end of the delinquent continuum, Sorrells (1980) studied juveniles who committed murder, and flatly states:

> Kids who kill come from violent, chaotic families. This is the most consistent finding from all the studies I've read on juvenile homicide...
>
> In my study, only 8 of the 31 juveniles who killed were even living with two parents at the time of the homicide. Twenty of the fathers and twenty-one of the mothers of these youngsters could be described as emotionally disturbed, alcoholic, violent and/or incompetent, or had left the home. (pp. 153-154)

Serdi and Blomgren (1975) in addition to discovering that juvenile murderers come from families characterized by brutality, also noted that many had become prey

to sexual seduction by their parents. My work also reflects Sendi and Blomgren's observation. One of my patients, a hard-working, articulate, 32 year old ex-Vietnam helicopter crew chief and Little League coach told me how he was frequently beaten by his erratic, punitive mother who would get beaten by her alcoholic husband, then would beat her son. He sadly told me that his mother would ...

> ...beat the hell out of me. She took no bullshit, and she would pick up anything she could get her hands on...switches, extension cords, and belts; belts were the easy part. I finally joined the Navy two days after my last whipping.

This man became a straight-arrow pillar of the community, until his childhood caught up with him and he was arrested for becoming aggressively involved in an incestuous relationship with his 14 year old stepdaughter, who then retaliated by stealing $400 from the Boy Scout fund of which he was in charge. I am quite sure that the delayed-action effect of corporal punishment can be a very long-term affair, not unlike a dormant disease that breaks out many years later. In all probability, corporal punishment is at the root of most "bad tempers."

Are the Effects of Corporal Punishment Confined to this Country, or are the Effects Cross-cultural?

Cross-cultural studies relating severe parenting to aggression are remarkably impressive. In one study, 12 investigators carefully studied 6 cultures and found a strong relationship between punitive, restricted child-rearing and cultural aggression (Whiting, 1963). O'Hanlon (1975) has intimated that the extremely violent acts committed by members of the Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland are a natural product of the brutal child-rearing practices of the poor, tense, distressed, and unhappy Irish Catholic mothers and fathers. After surveying the relationship between various child-rearing practices and aggression in a

wide range of cultures, Burke (1975) was moved to write:

> Punish the child and every blow will haunt your future. Less anxious parents will make for less anxious children...That urge to punish for his own good must be guarded against. The child cannot know the difference. Punishment in any form only reveals the ambivalence of the parents that is prompted by their own unmanageable impulses or is institutionalized to preserve the past. (p. 171, 172)

Burke's inescapable conclusion is that Doctor Spock was right in his first rather permissively oriented book on child care (see Spock, 1945) and wrong in his latest anti-permissive discussion of the teen years (see Spock, 1974). Burke comments:

> The astonishing conclusion one is tempted to draw from Spock's reversal is that he was unaware of the effect of his work. Actually, if the number of aggressive impulses is ever going to be reduced in our culture, our children will have to be reared with more indulgence. He was on the right track, but appears not to have known it. (p. 170)

With some trepidation and expected criticism, I have arrived at the same conclusion as Burke (see Welsh, 1976c, and Welsh, 1978).

The Implications of the Belt Theory for Education

It seems to me the first and most obvious implication of the belt theory is that we must stop hitting our children in the schools. As long as school personnel continue to hit children, parents at home will take comfort in doing the same to their youngsters. Aggression only begets aggression, and I don't think the high level of aggression in our Southern schools is an accident. I know of one school in the Deep South that equips teachers with automotive fan belts at the beginning of the school year, and one of my patients told me that her kindergarten teacher kept a refrigerator cord which she had christened the Old Black Magic, expressly to be used on any of the misbehaving tots. Most Southern educators, and other educators in the country who subscribe to corporal punishment, are convinced that school beatings

are the only thing that effectively prevents a troubled child from eventually entering a life of crime (see Welsh, 1976b). Yet, the opposite may actually be true. We obviously have very little short-term control over the beatings parents give children in the home, but we do have considerable control over the schools. The problem, as I view it, is the persistent, unflagging, and naive notion (now Supreme Court sanctioned) that hitting children is good for them.

Secondly, schools need to become more humane institutions, and I don't necessarily mean being permissive in the sense people now use the term. Children clearly need guidance, correction, a value system, and structure. They need to know the rules, but the rules need not be couched in threats which warn of dire consequences for minor transgressions. A first grader who gets a paddling for not bringing her homework to school in the morning and a paddling from her parents for upsetting the teacher when she returns home in the evening (which is so common in the poor black Southern schools), should never have to experience this. The educational concept of "back to basics" isn't such a bad idea if people did not have such a need to equate it with forced "patriotism, paddling, preaching, and puritanism" as Egerton (1976) has noted. I am firmly convinced that we must purge people's minds from equating permissiveness with neglect, and permissive parents with people who subscribe to an anything-goes attitude; clearly, benign neglect is a perfectly awful way to raise a child, and I can assure you that those children who kick holes in the walls, and knock cans off shelves in the supermarket are not the permissively raised youngsters--but rather far more commonly those raised in strict, punitive homes. Parents simply don't beat their children in public; they beat them behind closed doors.

Obviously we need to turn around the current notion that equates strictness with "conventional" discipline, and permissiveness with something terribly bad. It is truly ironic that Americans have never really been permissive in their child-rearing

practices, Doctor Spock notwithstanding; one investigator, Doctor Goodwin Watson, like all too many people, was surprised to find a clear behavioral advantage for children raised in permissive middle class homes versus those raised in middle class homes described as strict (see Watson, 1957).

The Challenge to the Schools

Obviously, our schools need to develop a more human approach to handling misbehavior, and the school personnel need to be aware of the prevelance of violence existing in the American home. As Richard Gelles (1974) has pointed out, violence in the family is probably as American as apple pie. Gelles found that his agency families (subjects known to agencies and the police) were obviously violent, but even among the controlled non-agency, non-police contact group, he found that 30% of the husbands admitted they had struck their wives at least once; and of all the 78 families with children, 96% admitted hitting them. Interestingly, the fathers tend to hit less than the mother. My own data with delinquents revealed that fathers were more aggressive with their sons, and mothers were more aggressive with their daughters. We must remember that all of these children must go to school, and many of them bring their aggressive feelings with them. Some of them are able to conform to the expectancies of the school, and somehow survive. Others are not so lucky. Those who fail to deal with their hostilities frequently take them out on their classmates, teachers, or even the walls of the restroom. Fueled with hostility generated by well-meaning, but misguided, punitive parents, and the need to avoid further parental punishment, the parent surrogates (school personnel, police, and others in authority) become the targets of their wrath. Unfortunately, the school often will call the parents, precipitating more beatings, or precipitating anger-inducing groundings which only complicate the situation and increase the breach

between the harried parent and his/her rebellious child.

It seems to me that the most effective solution is clear. Corporal punishment must be condemned by everyone in a responsible position to be heard, and this is probably more urgent in the black community where corporal punishment seems to be the most severe and the most destructive. In the meantime, the school must learn to manage the aggressive child. Parent conferences that provide constructive and non-punitive alternatives to further punishment, long groundings and further mistrust, are to be encouraged. Discussions with parents where the focus is on the child's inadequacies and belligerence, without looking at his strengths, should clearly be discouraged.

Finally, the roots of violence are in the home, and not in the TV set (see Kaplan & Singer, 1976), and are primarily developed from the type of parenting a parent modeled from his/her parent and not from what was learned by reading child-rearing manuals (see Welsh, 1975). It is imperative that we all understand that we cannot work with the aggressive child without focusing on the family. Often family counseling can help narrow the growing gulf between parent and child that is so common in the family of a delinquent, and school personnel must be able to recognize when the family is in such desperate straits that a referral is necessary. Ultimately, prevention will be the best solution, and this will never occur until the bulk of society has learned to accept that by sparing the rod, we will be sparing the child, and benefitting society as a whole.

References

Burke, C. Aggression in man. Secaucus, New Jersey: Lyle Stewart, Inc., 1975.

Cleckley, H. The mask of sanity (3rd ed.). St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1955.

Cloward, R. A. & Ohlin, L. E. Delinquency and opportunity: a theory of delinquent gangs. New York: Free Press, 1960.

Cohen, A. K. Delinquent boys: the culture of the gang. New York: Free Press, 1955.

Egerton, J. Back to basics. Current, Oct., 1976, pp. 27-33.

Eron, L., Walder, L. O. & Lefkowitz, M.M. Learning of aggression in children. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971.

Faber, H. Vandalism of school by 2 boys stund upstate town, New York Times, July 11, 1975, p. 28.

Feedback; a response to Dr. John Valusek. U. S. Catholic, May, 1976, 14-18.

Gelles, R. J. The violent home. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1974.

Hand, J. Teachers call for that old-time discipline, New York Daily News, Nov. 12, 1975, p. 48.

Hare, R. D. Psychopathy, autonomic functioning, and the orienting response, J. of Abnormal Psychol., Monogr. Supp., 1968, 73, (No. 3, Part 1, 1-24).

Inequality in education, Center for Law and Education, Cambridge, Mass. (corporal punishment issue), No. 23, September, 1978.

Kaplan, R. M. & Singer, R. D. Television violence and viewer aggression; a re-examination of the evidence, J. of Social Issues, 32, 1976, pp. 35-70.

Langner, T. S., Gersten, J. C. & Eisenberg, J. G. The epidemiology of mental disorders in children; implications for community psychiatry. Paper presented at the Fourth International Symposium of the Kittay Scientific Foundation, New York, N.Y., March, 1976.

Lorenz, K. On aggression, London: Methuen, 1966.

Moyer, K. Sex differences in aggression, in Friedman, R. C., Richart, R. M. & Van deWiele, R. L. Sex differences in behavior. John Wiley & Son, 1974 335-372.

O'Hanlon, T. J. The Irish. New York: Harper & Row, 1975, pp. 206-244.

Olson, L., Liebow, E., Mannino, F. V. & Shore, M. F., Runaway children 12 years later, J. of Family Issues, Vol. 1, No. 2, June, 1980, 165-188.

References (cont'd.)

Rothenberg, M. B. Effect of television violence on children and youth, J. of the Am. Medical Assoc., 1975, 234, 1043-1046.

Schlichter, K. J. & Ratliff, R. G. Discrimination learning in juvenile delinquents, J. of Abn. Soc. Psychol., 1971, 77, 46-48.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, B. & Levin, N. Patterns of child rearing. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Selye, H. The stress of life. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Sendi, I. B. & Blomgren, P. G. A comparative study of predictive criteria in th predisposition of homicidal adolescents, Amer. J. of Psychiatry, April, 1975 pp. 423-427.

Sommers, A. R. Violence, television, and the health of American youth. New England J. of Medicine, 1976, 294, 811-817.

Sorrells, J. Jr. What can be done about juvenile homicide? Crime & Delinquency, April, 1980, 152-161.

Spock, B. The common sense book of baby and child care. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1945.

Spock, B. Raising children in a difficult time. New York: W. W. Norton, 1974.

The Crime Wave, Time, June 30, 1975, 105, (27), 10-24.

Watson, G. Some personality differences in children related to strict or permissive discipline, J. of Psychol., June, 1957, pp. 227-249.

Welsh, R. S. Delinquency and parental exposure to severe parental punishment. Symposium paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Chicago, 1975.

Welsh, R. S. Delinquency, corporal punishment, and the schools, Crime & delinquency, July, 1978, 336-354.

Welsh, R. S. Severe parental punishment and delinquency: a developmental theory, J. Clin. Child Psychol., V. 5, No. 1, Spring, 1976a, 17-21.

Welsh, R. S. The Supreme Court spanking ruling: an issue in debate, presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., Sept.; 1976b. (Available through the Counseling and Personnel Services information center, University of Michigan, School of Education, Ann Arbor.)

Welsh, R. S. Violence, permissiveness, and the overpunished child, J. of Pediatric Psychol., V. 1, No. 2, Spring, 1976c, 68-71.

References (cont'd.)

West, D. J. The young offender. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1968.

Whiting, B. (ed.) Six cultures. New York: Wiley, 1963.

Wolfgang, M. E. Youth and violence. H.E.W. Sup. of Documents, U.S. Government printing office, Washington, D. C., 1970.